

03/17/05

**Honoring American Values Amendment
A More Fiscally and Morally Balanced Budget**

□

**HON. DAVID R. OBEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
March 17, 2005□**

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will enable the House to choose between the social Darwinism of the President's budget and a different budget which more accurately reflects the message of

the social gospel.

If we take a look at what the President has done, he inherited a \$240 billion surplus when he came into office, and yet the budget he presents to the Congress today contains a \$290 billion deficit. That deficit does not include the \$80 billion that we spent yesterday on the war on Iraq. It does not include the \$2 trillion it is estimated will be the cost of borrowing to pay for the personal or private accounts that the President wants to use to blow up Social Security. It does not include dollar one of the \$1.2 trillion it is estimated that it will cost to make the President's previously passed tax cuts permanent. So we have a huge deficit as far as the eye can see, under the President's budget.

Then the President tries to reclaim the mantle of fiscal responsibility by making some well-publicized cuts in the domestic discretionary portion of the budget. In plain terms, that is the appropriated part of the budget that goes for programs like education,

health care, science, veterans' benefits, things like that.

The President's cuts in the domestic arena do not lay a glove on the deficit because the deficit is so large; but I would point out, for instance, that those cuts average only about 5 percent of the over \$200 billion cost in this year's budget alone of the President's tax cuts. They are less than 20 percent of the over-\$50 billion in costs, for the cost of the supersize tax cuts that the President has given to the top 1 percent of earners in this country. But those cuts are large enough, Mr. Chairman, to do great damage over time in the investments that we need to make in education, health care, science, veterans, community infrastructure and

the like.

In real terms, those cuts amount, after you adjust for inflation, to about \$16 billion; and if you further adjust them for population growth, that is a real reduction in services of about \$19 billion for those programs.

So this amendment does basically three things. It cuts \$5 million from some of the President's proposed initiatives, and it combines those cuts with savings on the tax front.

What we do on the tax front is to just simply recognize the essential injustice of the fact that right now folks who make more than \$1 million in this country this year will on average get a \$140,000 tax cut. This amendment would limit that \$140,000 tax cut to about \$27,000 and save enough money to devote \$10 billion to deficit reduction and to use the other \$16 billion for the initiatives that we have outlined in the amendment in the area of education, health, science, veterans, homeland security, environment, law

enforcement, and community development.

Now, within that framework, we are able to add \$2.4 billion to programs that can do real things to reduce the pressures for abortions. Among the critical investments made by this amendment are a cluster of programs that would make it economically easier for low-income and vulnerable

women who choose to carry pregnancies to term by providing additional funding for maternal and infant health care, for child care and Head Start and after-school programs, for low-income housing assistance, for the community service block grant, to provide people with the opportunity to get help in the education and training areas, and also to provide additional medical services such as dental care. We also provide additional funding for

child abuse and domestic violence prevention programs.

Now, I would simply say that if our concern for life does not stop at the checkbook's edge, then these are initiatives which ought to be supported by everybody in this Chamber.

The reason I offer this amendment is because over the last 30 years something really bad has happened in this country. Thirty years ago, we had the smallest gap between rich and poor of any industrialized country in the world. Today, we have the largest gap between the rich and the poor of any industrialized country.

The wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country control 33 percent of the Nation's wealth. The poorest 40 percent are struggling to hang on to less than 3 percent of the Nation's wealth, and the President's budget makes it worse.

That is why I say that this amendment helps us choose between the social Darwinism of the President's package and values that more accurately reflect the social gospel.

Now, the opposition will say, “Oh, we do not need these additional education dollars because we have had such a large increase in education the past 2 years!”
Let me point out the

Republican majority
has been dragged
kicking and screaming
into supporting those
education increases.

If Congress had
approved House

Republican Labor-H
bills for education
over the past 10
years, we would be
spending \$19 billion
less on education
than we are
spending today. On
title I, if House
Republican bills had

passed, we would have spent \$2.8 billion less for title I grants to school districts than we are spending today. After-school centers, if the administration's budget request had been passed

throughout the years, we would be providing \$1 million less to local school districts for help in that program, and the list goes on and on.

So I would ask, Mr. Chairman, do we really want to pay for \$140,000 tax cuts for the most well-off people in this society by providing real cuts in the number of

grants that the
National Institutes
of Health will be
able to finance
research grants into
cancer, diabetes,
Parkinson's and the
like? Do we really
want to pay for

\$120,000 in tax cuts for the most well-off in this society by continuing to mount barriers that prevent people without means to get a college

education for their kids?

